



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,745	01/17/2000	Loredana Abramo	Abramo-1	8778

7590 12/28/2004

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP
1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE
SEVENTH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/483,745

Applicant(s)

ABRAMO, LOREDANA

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 15-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 15-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 9/21/04 to the application filed on 1/17/00.
2. Claims 15-22 are added.
3. Claims 13-14, which have not been entered in the previous amendment after the final rejection filed on June 22, 2004, were canceled by Applicant's representative, Alan Brandt, during the phone interview on 12/02/04.
4. Claims 1-12, 15-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 15, and 19 are independent claims.
5. The rejections of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Probert have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-12, 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in Bellamy, Jr. et al. (US Pat No. 6,259,907 B1, 7/10/01, filed 11/30/99) view of Probert, Jr. et al. (US Pat No. 6,549,918 B1, 4/15/03, filed 9/21/98).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding independent claim 1, Bellamy discloses:

- receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system, the raw switch data is stored by the digital switching system in a switch database (figure 1, col 5, line 59 to col 6, line 4)
- storing the raw cellular information in the switch database in the forms of tables (col 6, lines 6-23)

Bellamy does not disclose:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program
- outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program

Probert discloses:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program (figure 2 and col 8, lines 17-59: the network system includes the dynamic conversion filter driver to *convert data from one format to another*, including providing data *in spreadsheet format* where the data to be converted is from the server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Probert into Bellamy since Probert discloses the benefit of converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system, providing the advantage to incorporate into Bellamy for converting the raw data stored in the switch database the table format in Bellamy into the spreadsheet format.

Art Unit: 2178

Bellamy and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Bellamy and Probert to include said outputting and storing features since it was well known in the art that once the data is converted into a format such as spreadsheet, the data is displayed at the client, which is a form of outputting data, and the data is stored in the memory for later use. The combination of the outputting and storing features to Bellamy and Probert would help providing and checking data when needed and keeping the received data for later use.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Bellamy discloses:

- prior to said receiving, converting and outputting steps, installing said digital switch (figure 1: the cellular switch download database in the service control point implies that the digital switch is installed before receiving, converting and outputting steps since the digital switch must be installed so that there is switch data to be stored in the switch database)
- performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a New Product Introduction test (col 1, lines 27-49)

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Bellamy discloses:

- prior to said receiving, converting and outputting steps, installing said digital switch (figure 1: the cellular switch download database in the service control

Art Unit: 2178

point implies that the digital switch is installed before receiving, converting and outputting steps since the digital switch must be installed so that there is switch data to be stored in the switch database)

- performing said receiving, converting and outputting steps as part of a Customer Acceptance test (col 1, lines 50-58)

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Bellamy discloses:

- using the output of said converter as a layout, preparing scripts containing Database Modification Commands (col 5, line 59 to col 6, line 23 and col 3, lines 1-10: providing scripts for modifying the retrieved switch data in the switch database into a standardized format)
- transferring said scripts to said digital switch (col 5, lines 59-67: the fact that the scripts are executed and cause data from the cellular switches to be periodically downloaded to the cellular switch download database implies that the scripts are transferred to the digital switch to be executed)
- via said digital switch, executing said scripts to modify a switch database associated the raw switch data (col 5, lines 59-67)

Claims 5-6 include the same limitations as in claim 4, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 7 is for a system of claim 12, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Bellamy and Probert do not explicitly disclose the operation of said data receiver, data converter and data output device are adapted to be triggered via a user's "Make Workbook" command. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Probert to include the user's Make Workbook command since it was well known that spreadsheet has the command such as AutoFormat for formatting a workbook, which is a form of the Make Workbook command.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Bellamy discloses that the switch data includes testing data, which is one of hardware change data, software change data, switching activity data, *testing data*, troubleshooting data, and new product installation data (**col 3, lines 37-52**: since the retrieved data from the cellular telephone switches is used for analyzing, preventing, and detecting fraud or unauthorized use associated with cellular telephone calls, such data must include testing data).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Bellamy further discloses that the raw switch data includes recent change and verify data (**col 3, lines 37-52**: detecting fraud and unauthorized use associated with cellular telephone calls via the switch data implies that the switch data includes recent change and verify data).

Art Unit: 2178

Claims 11-12, which are dependent on claim 7, include the same limitations as in claims 9-10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 15, Bellamy discloses:

- receiving raw switch data from a digital switch (figure 1, col 5, line 59 to col 6, line 4)

Bellamy does not disclose:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program
- outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program

Probert discloses:

- converting said raw data into a format compatible with a predefined spreadsheet program (figure 2 and col 8, lines 17-59: the network system includes the dynamic conversion filter driver to *convert data from one format to another*, including providing data *in spreadsheet format* where the data to be converted is from the server)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Probert into Bellamy since Probert discloses the benefit of converting data in one format to the spreadsheet format applied in the network system, providing the advantage to incorporate into Bellamy for converting the raw data stored in the switch database the table format in Bellamy into the spreadsheet format.

Art Unit: 2178

Bellamy and Probert do not disclose outputting converted data to and storing said converted data in at least one predefined workbook of said spreadsheet program.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Bellamy and Probert to include said outputting and storing features since it was well known in the art that once the data is converted into a format such as spreadsheet, the data is displayed at the client, which is a form of outputting data, and the data is stored in the memory for later use. The combination of the outputting and storing features to Bellamy and Probert would help providing and checking data when needed and keeping the received data for later use.

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Bellamy discloses:

- using the output of said converter as a layout, preparing scripts containing Database Modification Commands (col 5, line 59 to col 6, line 23 and col 3, lines 1-10: providing scripts for modifying the retrieved switch data in the switch database into a standardized format)
- transferring said scripts to said digital switch (col 5, lines 59-67: the fact that the scripts are executed and cause data from the cellular switches to be periodically downloaded to the cellular switch download database implies that the scripts are transferred to the digital switch to be executed)
- via said digital switch, executing said scripts to modify a switch database associated the raw switch data (col 5, lines 59-67)

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 15, Bellamy discloses that the switch data includes testing data, which is one of hardware change data, software change data, switching activity data, *testing data*, troubleshooting data, and new product installation data (**col 3, lines 37-52**: since the retrieved data from the cellular telephone switches is used for analyzing, preventing, and detecting fraud or unauthorized use associated with cellular telephone calls, such data must include testing data).

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 15, Bellamy further discloses that the raw switch data includes recent change and verify data (**col 3, lines 37-52**: detecting fraud and unauthorized use associated with cellular telephone calls via the switch data implies that the switch data includes recent change and verify data).

Claims 19, 21-22 are for an apparatus of method claims 15-18, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 20 includes the same limitation of apparatus claim 8, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that Brown does not disclose receiving raw switch data from a digital switching system (Remarks, page 7).

Art Unit: 2178

Examiner agrees. Brown has been withdrawn from the rejections.

Bellamy discloses the argued feature (see the claim rejections above).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tasaki et al. (US Pat No. 6,785,268 B1, 8/31/04, filed 12/23/99).

Lee (US Pat No. 5,940,473, 8/17/99, filed 3/20/98).

Porter (US Pat No. 6,801,617 B1, 10/5/04, filed 9/16/99).

Kennelly et al. (US Pat No. 6,754,702 B1, 6/22/04, filed 10/2/98).

O' Neill, Jr. (US Pat No. 3,860,761, 1/14/75).

Stuparits et al. (US Pat No. 4,558,188, 12/10/85).

Beffel et al. (US Pat No. 5,187,733, 2/16/93).

Daniels et al. (US Pat No. 4,552,997, 11/12/85).

Dougherty et al. (US Pat No. 6,134,314, 10/17/00, filed 12/11/98).

Braun et al. (US Pat No. 6,501,953 B1, 12/31/02, filed 10/07/99).


Eastep et al. (US Pat No. 6,731,625 B1, 5/4/04, filed 2/10/97).

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh
Examiner
Art Unit 2178
12/17/04